



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

# **Women's Empowerment, Gendered Institutions and Economic Opportunity: An Investigative Study for Pakistan**

Parlow, Anton

University of Rostock

23 April 2018

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/93916/>

MPRA Paper No. 93916, posted 14 May 2019 14:30 UTC

# Women's Empowerment, Gendered Institutions and Economic Opportunity: An Investigative Study for Pakistan

Draft \*do not quote\*

Anton Parlow

April 2018

*Visiting Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, University of Rostock, Germany, Phone: +49-381-4984471,  
Email: anton.parlow@uni-rostock.de*

---

## Abstract

Increasing female landownership or labor force participation are policies designed to empower women in developing countries. Yet, societies are diverse and I find that across language and ethnic groups not all Pakistani women benefit from these increased economic opportunities in their decision making. I even find negative impacts of labor force participation on empowerment for some groups. This can be explained by different gender expectations along these gendered institutions.<sup>1</sup>

---

Keywords: Women's Empowerment, Ethnicity, Identity

JEL-Classification: I12, O12

---

<sup>1</sup>A special thanks goes to my student research assistant Florian Sklorz as well as colleagues for their invaluable comments.

## 1. Introduction

Empowering women can lead to better health and economic outcomes within the households. Empowered women typically invest more in the health of their children, invest in durable goods, and in the education of their children (Allendorf 2007, Mishra and Sam, 2016, Menon, Van der Meulen Rodgers, and Kennedy 2017). Furthermore, empowering women at the household level can lead over time to more gender equality and to economic development at the macroeconomic level (Duflo 2012). However, this process needs time and according to Duflo a continued effort from policy makers not just in developing countries. Though, gender inequality is higher in developing countries, and especially high in countries in South Asia. Here, especially Pakistan is ranked very low in gender equality.<sup>1</sup>

Yet, promoting this non-arguably noble goal can create potential problems. These problems can include the ineffectiveness of policies designed to promote women empowerment (Mabsout and Staveren 2009) but also increase tensions and create conflict between opposing groups within a country (Tahir 2017). This can raise the question of aid effectiveness which is typically considered to be more effective at the micro level (Doucouliagos and Paldam (2009,2010,2013), Denizer, Kaufmann and Kraay 2013). However, even at the micro level, the success of development policies depends on regional factors but also on factors like ethnicity, e.g. problems caused by ignoring cultural heterogeneity within a country and using the same policy recipe across diverse groups (Bhaumik, Gang, and Yun 2006).

Moreover, measuring women empowerment is not straightforward because empowerment itself contains many dimensions and a clear cut definition does not exist. Proposed indicators like the Women Empowerment's Index WEI (or for agriculture, the WEIA) include different domains. These domains can be agency, control over income, leadership within the community as well as control over resources and time in general (Alkire et al. 2013, Bacon et al. 2016). Other, indicators like the Global Gender Gap Index include even more dimensions.<sup>2</sup>

Most indices have in common that with empowerment the bargaining position of women within a household increases. Empowerment can be measured by some (increased) level of autonomy within

---

<sup>1</sup>Pakistan is ranked very low in gender equality. The 2016 Human Development Report (UNDP 2016) ranks Pakistan 130 out of 159 countries in 2015. Even lower, the Global Gender Gap Report 2016 (WEF 2016) ranks Pakistan on 143 out of 144 countries.

<sup>2</sup>The Global Gender Gap index also includes variables on health outcomes and more labor market outcomes (WEF 2016).

the household. Specifically, using household level data sets from developing countries, autonomy can include what kind of decisions can be made alone or sometimes jointly. Joint decision making is already an improvement in an environment where the husband (or older relatives) usually makes decisions alone. These decisions can include fertility preferences, deciding on (large) household purchases, leaving the house alone are something seemingly trivial as the decision over what kind of food to cook.

This raises the question of how the role of women is defined in a society, and further, if the definition is uniform across groups and if probable differences are testable. Empirically they are difficult to tackle down in demographic surveys designed for a different research question. Thus, I attempt a more indirect way. I explore the dimension of a gendered identity in the context of gendered institutions, a concept from gender studies (Acker 1992). Gendered institutions form the environment women (and men) live in and can be the law favoring men but also ethnicity differing by gender expectations, and thus, what role women have (Yuval-Davis 1994).

Mabsout and Staveren (2009) introduce this concept to the development economics literature to test the role of landownership on autonomy outcomes for women in Ethiopia. They assume that ethnicity can affect empowerment outcomes.

Here, I use Pakistan as an example and extent the discussion started by Mabsout and Staveren. Pakistan is typically considered a very patriarchal society limiting the role of (married) women to that of a child bearer (Ali et al. 2017). Household decisions are usually made by the husband or by older relatives. These expectations on the role of women define the individual (gendered) identity but are also formed by a group or ethnic identity.

Identity itself can be influenced by the environment someone grows up and lives in. This can be the ethnic group but also the language somebody uses. Some argue, that language defines most actions and shape the ethnic identity (Reyes 2010). Either way, I use both measurements of a group identity to test their impact on empowerment outcomes. Pakistan itself is a multi-ethnic but also multi-language society. There is an ample of literature showing that in this special case, language does affect and defines ethnic groups (Ahmed 1996, Rahman 1996, Ahmed 1999). Most of the internal conflicts in Pakistan are for instance over language instead of typical ethnic dimensions. For instance, Urdu is the official language but was only spoken by a minority when Pakistan was founded. Yet, it was made the language of school textbooks, official documents, radio. Ever since then, Pakistan has seen struggle over language issues (Rahman 1996).

In using the 2012/13 Pakistan Demographic and Health Survey (PHDS), I utilize landownership and the working status of women to test impact on empowerment outcomes. These outcome include decisions women can make at the household level. I find that landownership can empower women but as expected not across all language or ethnic groups. I also utilize another empowerment outcome from the domestic violence literature. Typically women who are empowered experience less domestic violence because they oppose their violent husbands. In using different outcomes of domestic violence, I find that women who own land, are less likely to be beaten. Yet, women who are working experience more domestic violence. A finding, which seems surprising at first but can be explained by husbands envying the likely better labor outcome of their wives (Eswaran and Malhotra 2011, Heath 2013). Thus, working can increase the vulnerability of women within the household. Additionally, these women cannot decide on how to spent their earnings. In a country with very low female employment rates, working can be seen as something negative, not expected from the ethnic or language group they belong to.

My paper is organized as follows. In section 2 I briefly discuss the language and ethnic groups and how they possibly differ in their gender expectations. These groups can be seen as gendered institutions forming identity. This is followed by a discussion of my data set and the empirical strategy in section 3. In section 4, I discuss the results. A conclusion follows in section 5.

## **2. Ethnic and Language Groups in Pakistan**

Pakistan is a country with many ethnic and language groups. According to the World Fact Book (CIA 2018) the major ethnic groups in Pakistan are Punjabis, Paschtuns, Sindhis, Saraikis, Muhajirs, Balochis, Hindkowans, Chitralis, and Gujarati. There are also smaller groups which can be mainly found in the North of the country.<sup>3</sup> Saraiki, Balochi, Hindko, and other languages at the state level. Further, English is also the official language for the government and used by the elite. The majority of Pakistani are mostly Muslims (96,4 percent in 2010). Other religions include Hindu, Christians and smaller sects. Most of the literature on ethnic and languages groups discusses the role of potential for conflict between these groups and between minor groups and the government. Pakistan has been striven by internal conflict since 1947 and the literature focuses on the historic roots and developments of these conflicts (Ahmed 1996, Rahman 1996, Ahmed 1999).

---

<sup>3</sup>The distributions is as follows: Punjabi 44.7%, Pashtun 15.4%, Sindhi 14.1%, Sariaki 8.4%, Muhajirs 7.6%, Balochi 3.6%, and other groups 6.3% (CIA 2018).

Thus, the role of women and is merely not discussed, at least in the English literature available outside of Pakistan.<sup>4</sup>

Yet, these groups have deep historic roots long before Pakistan was founded, differences not just in their languages and thus it can be assumed that they have different gender expectations along with their ethnic (or language) group identity. Matsoub and Staveren (2010) argue that ethnicity is another example of a gendered institution. This is true, given that different ethnic groups have different expectations in doing gender. Similarly, one could argue that a language group does the same. Overall, the difference between these concepts are small and maybe the concept of group identity (Edwards 2009) or social identity (Kelly-Hall 2012) fits these as well. These form the individual identity, daily routines, own expectations and expectations of what is expected.

I use ethnicity and language as gendered institution in this paper and interchangeably. These overlap because ethnic groups have their own language. The question is how much do they overlap, e.g. can ethnic groups have different languages or can a language belong to different ethnic groups. The answer is yes, and for Pakistan a diverse culture, this is also true. In Table 1 I show how ethnic groups and language groups overlap for the data set, I use. Interestingly, although Urdu is a language a majority identifies themselves as Urdu, e.g. as an ethnic group.<sup>5</sup>

Even if I use ethnic and language groups as similar concepts in my empirical models it should be noted, that linguists argue that language defines someones identity more than ethnic identity because language is something someone is born into and has no choice over (Joseph 2004, Reyes 2010, Kelly-Hall 2012).

[Table 1 about here]

From the available literature it is difficult to judge how language or ethnic groups differ in doing gender, e.g. if some groups are more progressive than others towards women empowerment. Tariq (1996) and Lall (2011) are an exemption and give at least a starting point for the empirical analysis following.

---

<sup>4</sup>I do not assume that there is much written in Urdu or other Pakistani languages either. Nonetheless, Pakistan is a very patriarchal society changing slowly to more gender equality and recognizing issues regarding the rights of women. For instance, after years of discussion, violence against women is since 2012 a punishable crime, at least in one state (Balochistan).

<sup>5</sup>This could also be because the level of education is very low on the average in the households interviewed and the question was misinterpreted.

Tariq (1996) analyses the internal conflict in Pakistan as a conflict between language groups and the official government forcing languages (e.g. Urdu) on these groups. He illustrates the motives and the origin of the language groups and their struggle until they were officially recognized by the government of Pakistan. However, sometimes, he notes that some groups are more progressive towards education in general. This could be a puzzle piece and be interpreted as a more progressive group identity likely not opposing women empowerment. The Pashtu identity is described as egalitarian and values autonomy. Furthermore, the Balochi and Mohajir value education. However, the role of gender is not mentioned at all.

In contrast, Lall (2011) focuses directly on the attitude of parents from different ethnic groups towards schooling of their girls. She analyses their motives in a qualitative research design. Even if the samples are relatively small, e.g. 89 parents from five different ethnic groups living in different rural areas, this can be another puzzle piece. These parents are Punjabi, Balochi, Sindhis, Pathans and Bengalis. She finds that Punjabi, Balochi, Pathans and Bengalis have a strong culture of the inclusion of girls, while Sindhis show the highest level of gender disparity.

I introduce a final descriptive puzzle piece in the section following. I use the Pakistan DHS to identify differences between the ethnic and language groups for various outcomes related to women empowerment.

### **3. Data, Descriptive Statistics and Empirical Strategy**

#### *Data and Descriptive Statistics*

To estimate the effect of landownership and labor force participation on women empowerment, I utilize the Pakistan 2012/13 Demographic and Health Survey (PDHS). The PDHS is a nationally representative household survey and contains questions on women's decision making in the household but also a module on domestic violence. In total 13,588 ever-married women of age 15 to 49 were interviewed belonging to 3,134 households. The domestic violence module interviewed a smaller sample of women of 3,687 women.

In countries heavily based on agriculture, landownership is a mean to generate more stable income, and for women, reduce the dependency of their husbands (Mishra and Sam 2016, Menon, van der Meulen Rodgers, and Kennedy 2017). 64 percent of the Pakistani population lives in rural areas and a majority lives from agriculture (Agricultural Census 2010). Landownership of women is guaranteed by the constitution of Pakistan since 1973. Women for instance can buy, inherit or

obtain land by dowry (Khattak, Brohi, and Anwar 2010). Yet, only a minority of women have landownership alone (or jointly).

In contrast, the labor force participation of woman is higher than the landownership rates. Working outside the home is another mean to increase household income, and, thus, economic safety as well as reducing the monetary dependency of the husband. In Pakistan female labor force participation has steadily been increasing since the 1970's (Ejaz 2007) and is currently around 15 percent. Compared to other developing countries this rate is still relatively low. Mostly more educated and younger women decide to work (Naqvi and Shahnaz 2002, Ejaz 2007)

In Table 2 I present a variety of women's empowerment outcomes which can be found in the literature. I sorted them according to categories women should be able to decide on, e.g. fertility, health and labor market related outcomes. Given, I focus on landownership and labor force participation as means to increase women's empowerment, I tabulate averages for these indicators. Additionally, I add if women are regularly beaten. The picture is quite diverse but overall women with landownership have more say in the household than women who do not own land. The least say in household decisions have women who are frequently beaten by their husband. The picture is more diverse for working women. It depends on the indicator chosen but there is a tendency that these are slightly empowered compared to women who are not working. However, my focus will be on the decision making within the household along the dimension language and ethnicity.

[Table 2 about here]

Along the dimensions language and ethnicity, I chose indicators more relevant to my paper. These include foremost questions about decision making and therefore related to autonomy. It is already possible to judge these groups according to their openness to female empowerment at this purely descriptive point. Typically, along the items chosen a indicator could be constructed. The WEI and similar indicators are examples. In constructing a simple index, I assign a '1' if an item is above the overall average and a '0' if below. I sum these and divide the sum by the number of items. If a language or ethnic group is above the average over all items it could have the highest value of '1'. In contrast, the lowest value would be '0' if the group is constantly below the overall average.

In Table 3 and in Table 4 I present average values for education, beaten and different decision



making outcomes. In the last column a simple index is computed. Most of these variables correlate with education. Educated women are typically more aware about their rights and also able to make informed decisions, e.g. over their own well-being or of their children. I have eight language groups and a group other where other smaller groups are summarized. As expected, I have more ethnic groups available, 19 and one group for other. Urdu and Punjabi groups are open the most towards women empowerment along the language and ethnic group definition. Once focusing on ethnicity only, Kashmiri, Hindko, and Brushaski are also open towards women empowerment. Pushto and Balochi are least open towards women empowerment. Urdu, Punjabi are one of the major ethnic groups in Pakistan. However, from these purely descriptive findings, I cannot judge how landownership and the working status affect women's empowerment and how possible effects differ across gendered institutions. I test the effect in the estimations following.

[Table 3 and Table 4 about here]

### *Empirical Strategy*

I use a standard linear probability model (LPM) to test the impact of landownership and labor force participation (LFP) on women's autonomy. The empirical model takes the following form:

$$\text{Autonomy}_{ij} = \alpha + \gamma \text{Landownership}_{ij} + \delta \text{Working}_{ij} + \beta_1 \text{Woman}_{ijt} + \beta_2 \text{SES}_{ijt} + \rho_j + \epsilon_{ij} \quad (1)$$

I measure women's empowerment as autonomy outcomes. Autonomy of a women  $i$  belonging to language or ethnic group  $j$  include outcomes on decision making. These decisions at the household level are: if a woman can decide alone on visiting a health facility, on spending her own earnings, on large household purchases and on family visits. The main variables of interest are landownership and the working status, i.e. the labor force participation. These are typically considered to have mostly positive effects on women's empowerment. If a woman  $i$  belonging to group  $j$  owns land alone, the variable landownership takes the value of '1' and zero otherwise. Similarly, if a woman  $i$  belonging to group  $j$  is working the variable LFP takes the value of '1' and zero otherwise.

Information on age, education, number of children und the age difference between her husband can be found in the variable Woman. The variable SES, socio-economic status, includes the wealth status and if the households lives in an urban area. The variable  $\rho_j$  includes the region a household lives in but also indicators for language group and ethnic group in my baseline regressions to account

for possible endogeneity caused by omitted variable bias (OVB). It is likely that autonomy and landownership or working status are influenced by gender expectations as Mabsout and Staveren (2009) argue. Omitting the ethnic group can cause OVB, because some groups are more open towards women empowerment than others. Yet, including indicators on these groups can also be found in previous work but the interpretation is different here. I include these dummy variables in my baseline regressions and test their significance. If they are significant, the information on language and ethnic group should be used further. Thus, I test the impact of landownership and working status on autonomy by language group and ethnic group in additional regressions.  $\epsilon_{ij}$  is a standard robust error term. It is possible to cluster the standard errors along the ethnic group or language group level but this will become obsolete, once I estimate the above equation by language or ethnicity.

Later, and additionally, I change the autonomy outcome variable to outcomes for domestic violence. Domestic violence is often more accepted by less empowered women and it can be assumed that with increased empowerment, women are less likely to accept domestic violence (Finnoff 2012, Niaz, Hassan, and Tariq 2017) and domestic violence outcomes should be less in the household.

## 4. Results

### *Baseline Models*

In Table 5 I show results for models including landownership and the working status of women as possible means to increase women empowerment. I have four decision making outcomes: health, earnings, purchases, and family visits. Per decision making outcome I have three models. One model without language and ethnic group variables, one model with language group variables and one model with ethnic group variables, additionally to my standard control variables. Before turning to the discussion of my main variables of interest, I discuss briefly the role of age, education and similar control variables.

Older women are in the bargaining literature considered to have more bargaining power within the household, and thus, can be more empowered. They are more experienced in handling their own position within the household. A similar argument can be made for education. Educated women are more aware about their rights and their position within the household (Taucher 1991, 1995, Aizer 2011). I find that older and more educated women can decide more on health facility visits, purchases and family visits. For deciding on their own earnings the effect is not significant. This can be because the sample is significantly smaller, e.g. before I had more than 12,000 observations

and for labor earnings ca. 2200 women. Furthermore, these women are younger and already more educated than the overall sample. However, it should be noted, that education in Pakistan mostly means women visited only a few years of basic schooling. Women in urban areas are more empowered than women in rural areas. The age difference, e.g. if the husband is older, has a small negative impact on the household decision making of women.

Landownership is typically considered to increase women empowerment (Mabsout and Staveren 2009, Mishra, Khusbu, and Sam Abdoul 2016, Menon, van der Meulen Rodgers, and Kennedy 2017). Here, I find that for the overall sample landownership has no significant effect on any of the decision making variables. This is unexpected and does not change, once adding language or ethnicity control variables. A possible explanation could be, that only a few women do own land in Pakistan. Another explanation could be that this overall effect masks a possible different effect at the language or ethnic group level. Here, different gender expectations could matter and different effects of landownership on decision making are more than likely. Thus, I come back to this possible channel after discussing the impact of the working status of women for the overall sample.

The working status of women has a significant effect on decision making. However, the impact of working status is not positive across all dimensions of decision making. While, women who are working can decide more on health visits, large purchases and family visits, they cannot decide on their own earnings. In a patriarchal society like Pakistan, husbands can have the decision power over the household total income. Even if the overall position of women seem to improve by deciding on other questions, not deciding on their own earnings is a drawback, when it comes to women empowerment. Deciding on their own earnings seems relatively more important than deciding on for instance family visits. In a bargaining game, this could be seen as something the husband gives in the sense of a "stick and carrot" action or a concession to the wife, but takes away in deciding on earnings. Nonetheless, she could decide not to work as threat.<sup>6</sup>

At the bottom of Table 5 I show the p-values for a joint-significance F-Test for including language or ethnic group variables into the estimation. Matsoub and Staveren (2009) argue while not including ethnic groups in their Ethiopian sample, an omitted variable bias (OVb) could be created. This is a source of endogeneity because language or ethnic groups have different gender expectations. Thus, they can be seen as gendered institutions or groups having a gendered identity. If some groups are generally more open towards women empowerment for instance, women

---

<sup>6</sup>However, a likely non-credible threat, if women have to work because the household is poor.

can work or decide more to begin with. Excluding these control variable would bias coefficient of working status (or landownership). Here, I find, even if there are significant, the results do not change. At least this source of endogeneity is likely not present in my sample. However, I take the joint significance of language or ethnic group variables as a suggestions that it matters to what group someone belongs to and show in Table 6 and in Table 7 the effect of landownership and working status by these gendered institutions.

[Table 5 about here]

### *Estimations by gendered institutions*

I show the effect of landownership and working status on women's empowerment by language group and ethnic group in two separate tables. For clarity reasons, I only present the coefficients of these two variables. The control variables not shown are the same as above. I begin the discussion by language group in Table 6. For the overall sample I found no significant effect of landownership on any decision making outcome. Once focussing on language groups, I do find an significant effect for some groups. However, the effect of landownership for these groups is negative. Women who own land can decide less than women who do not own land. Thus, owning land does not improve their bargaining position within the household but actually decreases it. This can be explained by envy of the husband not owning land. Remember, this is landownership solely by the wife and not jointly by wife and husband.

The findings for working status are more diverse than before. While for the whole sample I found a negative impact for earnings and a positive effects for other dimensions of decision making, here I find these effects only for a few language groups. Some groups are more open, e.g. Urdu or Punjabi, towards women empowerment than other language groups. Yet, none of the language groups allows women to decide on their own earnings. The financial responsibility lies with the husband and this seems to be deeply rooted in the Pakistani culture. Less monetary decisions (e.g. over the use of time) is more a female matter and typically considered to be made by women anyways, e.g. health facility or family visits.

[Table 6 about here]

In Table 7 I use the same models as above and show the effect of my two empowerment variables on decision making by ethnic groups. Ethnic groups like language groups can have different gendered expectations but I cannot show if these expectations differ between ethnic and language groups. It is likely, that language defines ethnic identity more than vice versa, and thus, the expectations in that definition of a gendered institution should be similar. For instance, many Urdu speaking Pakistani identify themselves as Urdu. Yet, Urdu is not considered to be an ethnicity in Pakistan. Further, in comparison to the sample size for language groups, the use of ethnic groups results in very small samples for some groups. These include foremost e.g. the English, the Whakhi, Marwari and Farsi ethnicity. With this limitation, using language as an identifier is from a sample size point of view maybe the preferable option. However, for the major ethnic groups I can judge the empowerment effect of landownership and working status.

Compared to the use of language groups as a gendered institution, I find a significant effect of landownership on women’s decision making. Though, the effect of landownership varies between the ethnic groups drastically. Before, I found an insignificant effect. Now, I can identify groups where landownership has a positive effect on women’s empowerment, no significant effect but also a negative effect. However, the tendency is no effect or mostly a significant negative effect. For the language groups I identified as more open before, e.g. Urdu and Punjabi, landownership has no effect across any decision making outcome. Though, for groups likely less open to women’s empowerment, e.g. Pahari and Balochi, there is tendency that this previous finding can be found here again. The negative effect of landownership could again be explained by envy through the husband. It is probable that he accepts that the wife owns land but otherwise does not give her any more freedom in decision making. Why is the wife not leaving the husband could be asked. Surely, she has some economic safety with owning land and could leave the husband. First, she could just accept her role as a Pakistani woman as a child bearer and leaves most decision to the husband. Second, leaving the husband is in Pakistan often not an option, because women could be ousted by relatives or even victim of a honor killing (Aurat Foundation 2014). Furthermore, domestic violence is very common in Pakistan and not opposing the husband could reduce the risk to become a victim of domestic violence. Because of this, in the last part of my paper I analyse the effect of landownership and working on status on domestic violence outcomes. Some authors use domestic violence as another empowerment outcome, e.g. empowered women accept violence less (Diallo and Voia 2016, Sohini 2016, Lenze and Klasen 2017).

The results for working status of women on their ability to make decisions at home, are similar to the findings for language groups. Women in some ethnic groups have more say in health facility visits, large purchases and family visits. These groups are previously assumed to be more open towards empowerment, e.g. Urdu, Punjabi, Siraiki and Hindko. Yet, as I found before, this finding reverse for deciding on the own earnings. Here, working status has no effect or even a negative significant effect. There is not a single ethnic group where women who have their own earnings can decide on how to use these directly. From an empowerment view this a throwback, getting women to work outside the home is in the empowerment literature one of the major means to empower them. Even, if they have say over the other decision making outcomes, as above, I assume this more or less a concession from the husband. Nonetheless, he also has a benefit from his wife working and attributing to the household income additionally to her household work and her role as a mother.

[Table 7 about here]

#### *Another channel to women's empowerment - domestic violence*

The reasons for domestic violence (DV) can be manifold, and there as such, are economic models explaining domestic violence (DV) within the household context (Tauchen, Witte, and Long 1991, Tauchen and Witte 1995). DV can be seen as instrument to exert power to induce or change behavior of the victim (typically women) or sometimes even just an instrument to increases utility by deriving pleasure from these actions. Still, DV changes the distribution of wealth within a household towards the male perpetrator. In more modern settings DV is seen within bargaining models where the "normal" bargaining fails and violence is used as mean to maintain the own position within the household.

Risk factors at the individual level can include low self esteem and being exposed to violence during childhood can be reasons to be violent against someone's partner (Tauchen, Witte, and Long 1991). Further reasons are the usual suspects, low levels of education, unemployment (usually the male) alcoholism and drug abuse and other channels inducing stress at the individual level (Averett and Wang 2016). Risk factors at the household level typically include low income (Tauchen, Witte, and Long 1991, WHO 2005, Aizer 2011). While at the societal level, traditional gender roles and expectations play in developing countries a major role in committing domestic violence (WHO 2005, Finnoff 2012). Gender expectations are the main reason for the high rates of domestic violence,

and violence against women in general, in patriarchal societies like the one in Pakistan (Aurat Foundation 2014, Ali et al. 2015).

However, empowered women are quite often less accepting of domestic violence (Justino, Leone, and Salardi 2015, Diallo and Voia 2016, Sohini 2016, Lenze and Klasen 2017). This is why some authors use DV as an empowerment outcome. Yet, I see DV as an indirect channel of women's empowerment because typically variables increasing women's empowerment do not necessarily have to affect DV. Nonetheless, working status was used in the past (Diallo and Voia 2016, Sohini 2016, Lenze and Klasen 2017). Here, I use landownership additionally as an empowerment outcome reducing domestic violence at the household level. If, landownership can empower women, and empowered women are likely to be less accepting of DV, landownership could (or should) have a similar effect on DV as working status has.

My empirical analysis is similar to the above. My empowerment outcomes changes to various domestic violence outcomes. These include if a woman was beaten, threaten, humiliated or insulted frequently in the 12 months before the survey was taken. I include risk factors like alcoholism and unemployment of the husband as additional control variables. Note, that the sample of women is reduced to roughly 3400 women because not all women were asked about domestic violence. The empirical model is of following form and estimated by a linear probability model:

$$DV_{ij} = \alpha + \gamma \text{Empowerment}_i + \beta \text{Women}_i + \theta \text{Husband}_i + \delta \text{SES}_i + \epsilon_{ij} \quad (2)$$

$DV_{ij}$  is a variable indicating the domestic violence experience in the last 12 months of woman  $i$  being a member of the gendered institution (language or ethnic group)  $j$ . These outcomes include being beaten, threatened, humiliated or insulted by the husband. The variable Empowerment is landownership and working status of woman  $i$ . Standard information on the wife and on the husband (e.g. working status, alcoholism) can be found in the variable Women and Husband. Household characteristics are included in the variable SES. I follow the same estimation strategy as before. First I estimate a model for all women including control variables for language group or ethnicity. Then I estimate the effect by language group and ethnic group to show the effect of empowerment variables on domestic violence outcomes at the gendered institution level.

In Table 8 I show the results of working status and landownership on DV for the overall sample. I do not report all coefficients to focus on the empowerment outcomes and alcoholism. Alcoholism of the husband is the usual suspect why violence takes place within the household. Thus, the effect

of alcoholism on DV is pronounced.

As above landownership itself has no significant effect on DV outcomes. Yet, the signs of the estimations coefficients are mostly negative and I assume, once focusing on effects at the gendered group level, some language or ethnic groups are likely to have, a positive effect on landownership in reducing domestic violence. However, the effect of working on DV outcomes is significant, and, even negative. Thus, women who work are more likely to experience some form of domestic violence. The likelihood of experiencing DV ranges from 2 to 3 percent depending on the type of DV. Compared to alcoholism it is significant less, but given, that getting women to work is usually something positive, e.g. empowers the woman, here I find a side effect which should be not ignored. This finding was found by other for some parts of their samples before (Eswaran and Malhotra 2011, Heath 2013). The husband could envy the income of the woman, or if she opposes him because she feels empowered by work, he will maintain is bargaining position within the household by violence. This finding is sometimes known as male-backlash (Aizer 2007). This effect can be more pronounced in Pakistan, because DV is more common to begin with and sometimes even accepted by the women. The PHDS offers some question on acceptance of DV by women and up to 25 percent of the women in this sample, agree that there are good reasons for DV, e.g. burned food or going out without permission.

[Table 8 about here]

At the gendered institution level, the picture changes. Landownership reduces domestic violence for some language groups (Table 9) and ethnic groups (Table 10). This is an encouraging finding given that landownership had mostly no effect on decision making. I identified some of these groups as more open to empowerment in my summary tables before. However, less encouraging is, that working increase domestic violence. The finding is similar to above where I found that working women have less say in how to spent their earnings. Arguably, the husband could envy that the wife is working. Even further, it is also likely that some of her duties at home could suffer from her working outside the home. This could increase tensions between her and the husband. As I found previously, groups like Urdu or Punjabi seem to more progressive towards women in some categories but when women work, this increase for instance being beaten, the most severe form of DV. This could conflict more with traditional gender expectations than allowing her to decide on



seemingly for the male, less important decisions at home.

### *Possible robustness checks*

The above analysis is of explorative nature. My focus is on showing that language or ethnic groups differ in women empowerment outcomes, and thus, in their gender expectations. With this, they arguably have a gendered group identity and could be seen as a gendered institution. Yet, it is always possible to use more empowerment outcomes, like fertility preference, or some more decision making outcomes, e.g. what food to cook. However, I already choose decision making outcomes more important for the household. Furthermore, I could use an empowerment index, similar to the WEI. Though, I lack information on actually income or community involvement. I used a simple index for a purely descriptive argument, knowing it lacks information for a deeper analysis. However, a major concern is the usual issue of endogeneity. While, OVB may not exist once controlling for the language or ethnic group women belong to, the issue of reversed causality should be kept in mind. The major concern is, what if empowered women are more prone to work or more prone to own land, and thus estimating the impact of these variables improving empowerment could be biased. For now, I cannot deal with this issue because of a lack of possible instruments. I would need an instrument explaining landownership without affecting the decision making or DV outcome, and a similar problem arises the labor force participation of women. What happens if DV at home drives women out of the home into work to avoid hostilities. For instance, Lenze and Klasen (2017) find after instrumenting for the working status of women that a previous positive effect on DV vanishes. They use the average labor force participation of women in the same cluster. For the sake of my argument, that there is gendered group identity, this IV would already be an empowerment outcome itself.

Nonetheless, I make the argument that there could be reasons why endogeneity itself may be of minor nature. For instance, only a minority of two percent of the women in the sample own land. Although, I do not know how they got the land, in Pakistan it is more common to own land as dowry or as an inheritance. If this is true for most women, empowerment itself has little effect on landownership. Furthermore, Pakistan is one of the poorest countries of the world. Women need to work to supplement the household total income. The labor force participation in my sample is significantly higher among women at the lower end of the wealth distribution. Then, the reason for work is a purely economic one, and not DV at home. This becomes even a less of an issue considering that 25 to 30 percent of the women accept some form of DV if they do something

wrong at home.

## 5. Conclusion

Empowering women and promoting gender equality are two of the new millennium development goals of the UN. Pakistan scores very low in many gender equality indicators. Given, that empowering women has positive effects on health and educational outcomes at the household level and over time at the macroeconomic level, understanding factors driving empowerment in countries like Pakistan is crucial. Yet, in many studies the dimension of gendered group identity has been overlooked. Ethnic groups (or language groups) have their own (gendered) identity. Within a group gender expectations are formed, and thus a gendered institution is present. These gender expectations influence the daily lives of women. Furthermore, gender expectations at the ethnic (or language) group level can influence the effectiveness of policies promoting women empowerment if group heterogeneity is ignored. Even further, in a male dominated society like Pakistan promoting women empowerment is difficult to begin with and thus accounting of these differences in gender expectations can prove fruitful.

Here I use the labor force participation and landownership of women to estimate their effect on empowerment outcomes, foremost decision making at the household level but also domestic violence outcomes. In using the 2012 / 13 Pakistan Demographic Health Survey, I find that their effect is not uniform across ethnic or language groups. For less important decisions women can make at home I find a positive effect. However, for deciding on their own earnings, I find that working women are not able to fully decide how to spend these earnings. Furthermore, these women also suffer more under violence at home. Yet, there is some hope. Landownership decreases domestic violence at home for some groups, while not having a significant effect on decision making.

I cannot explain in detail where the difference between ethnic or language groups originate from. Yes, they are historically grown but exploring these roots is a task I leave to anthropologists or sociologists. Further, the issue of endogeneity may be still present, even if I gave some reasons why the concern of endogeneity can be lessened. I assume that strong gender expectations are present in Pakistan which have deep historic roots. Thus, they can be seen as mostly exogenous in the short run. Further, I use established empowerment indicators typically not showing what empowerment means to the women. Future work (and surveys) could explore this dimension further. O'Hara and Clement (2018) use an empowerment consciousness index which is an interesting and promising

step into a deeper understanding of the empowerment mechanisms at the individual but also group level.

However, promoting women labor force participation and landownership in Pakistan should not be stopped. Even if it is a long process, changing the perception towards domestic violence should likely to be addressed first. Domestic violence is widely accepted in Pakistan and laws are mostly protecting the male perpetrators. Organizations like Violence against Women have some success in changing this, for instance at the state level. Additionally, it has been shown that media campaigns in India have changed perception towards DV for instance (Bhushan and Singh 2014).

## References

- [1] Acker Joan (1992) "From Sex Roles to Gendered Institutions", *Contemporary Sociology* Vol. 21 No. 5, pp. 565-569
- [2] Agricultural Census (2010) "Agricultural Census 2010 - Pakistan Report", Government of Pakistan
- [3] Ahmed Isthiaq (1996) "State, Nation and Ethnicity in Contemporary South Asia", Pinter A - Cassell Imprint
- [4] Ahmed Feroz (1999) "Ethnicity and Politics in Pakistan", Oxford University Press
- [5] Aizer Anna (2011) "Poverty, Violence, and Health", *Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 46. No.3, pp.518-538
- [6] Ali A. Parveen, Naylor B. Paul, Croot Elizabeth, and O'Cathain Alicia (2015) "Intimate Partner Violence in Pakistan: A systemic review", *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, Vol. 16 No.3, pp.299-315
- [7] Alkire Sabina, Meinzen-Dick Ruth, Peterman Amber, Quisumbing Agnes, Seymour Greg, and Vaz Ana (2013) "The Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index", Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (OPHI) Working Paper No.58
- [8] Allendorf Karen (2007) "Do Women's Land Rights Promote Empowerment and Child Health in Nepal?", *World Development*, Vol. 35 No.11, pp.1975-1988
- [9] Aurat Foundation (2014) "Violence against Women in Pakistan: A qualitative review of reported incidences", <https://www.af.org.pk/vaw-reports.php>, last accessed 10/04/2017
- [10] Averett Susan and Wang Yang (2016) "Identifying the Casual Effect of Alcohol Abuse on the Perpetration of Intimate Partner Violence by Men using a Natural Experiment", *Southern Economic Journal*, Vol. 83 No.5, pp.667-724
- [11] Bacon Lisa, Fogit Nicole, Jorstad Krista, Marczynski, Nethero Julia, and Sautory Albane (2016) "Learning from the Women's Empowerment Index: Case Studies on the Income and Time Domains", The Hunger Project and Columbia School of International and Public Affairs, <https://sipa.columbia.edu/file/3365/download?token=goIWWVsW>, last accessed 03/20/2018
- [12] Bhaumik Kumar Sumon, Gang Ira, and Yun Myeong-Su (2006) "Ethnic Conflict and Economic Disparity: Serbians and Albanians in Kosovo", *Journal of Comparative Economics*, Vol. 34, pp.754-773
- [13] Bhushan Kuhuk, and Singh Prakarsh (2014) "The Effect of Media on Domestic Violence Norms: Evidence from India", *The Economics of Peace and Security Journal*, Vol. 9 No.1, pp.58-63
- [14] CIA (2018) "The World Fact Book - Pakistan", <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/pk.html>, last accessed 03/27/2018
- [15] Denizer Cevdet, Kaufmann Daniel, and Kraay Art (2013) "Good countries of good projects? Macro and micro correlates of World Bank project performance", *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 105, pp.288-302

- [16] Diallo Saikou Amadou , and Marcel Voia (2016) "The Threat of Domestic Violence and Women Empowerment: The Case of West Africa", *African Development Review*, Vol.28 No.1, pp. 92-103
- [17] Doucouliagas Hristos, and Paldam Martin (2009) "The Aid Effectiveness Literature: The Sad Results of 40 Years of Research", *Journal of Economic Surveys*, Vol.23 No. 3, pp.433-461
- [18] Doucouliagas Hristos, and Paldam Martin (2010) "Conditional Aid Effectiveness: A Meta-Study", *Journal of International Development*, Vol. 22, pp.391-410
- [19] Doucouliagas Hristos, and Paldam Martin (2013) "The Robust Result in Meta-analysis of Aid Effectiveness: A Response to Mekasha and Tarp", *Journal of Development Studies*, Vol. 49 No.4, pp.584-587
- [20] Duflo, Esther (2012) "Women Empowerment and Economic Development", *Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. 50 No.4, pp.1051-1079
- [21] Ejaz Mehak (2007) "Determinants of Female Labor Force Participation in Pakistan: An Empirical Analysis of PSLM (2004-05) Micro Data", *The Lahore Journal of Economics*, September 2007, pp.203-235
- [22] Eswaran Mukesh, and Malhotra Nisha (2011) "Domestic Violence and Women's Autonomy in Developing Countries: Theory and Evidence", *Canadian Journal of Economics*, Vol. 44 No.4, pp.1222-1263
- [23] Finnoff Kate (2012) "Intimate Partner Violence, Female Employment and Male Backlash in Rwanda", *The Economics of Peace and Security Journal*, Vol. 7 No.2, pp.13-24
- [24] Heath Rachel (2013) "Women's Access to Labor Market Opportunities, Control of Household Resources, and Domestic Violence: Evidence from Bangladesh", *World Development*, Vol. 57, pp.32-46
- [25] Joseph E. John (2004) "Language and Identity: National, Ethnic, Religious", Palgrave-Macmillian
- [26] Justino Patricia, Leone Marielle, and Salardi Paola (2015) "Does War Empower Women? Evidence from Timor Leste", *IDS Evidence Report 121*,
- [27] Khattak Saba, Brohi Nazish, and Anwar Wajiha (2010) "Women's Land Rights: Research Findings from Pakistan", *Project Report No. 18*, Sustainable Development Policy Institute, [sdpi.org](http://sdpi.org), last accessed 04/06/2018
- [28] Kelly-Hall Joan (2012) "Teaching and Researching Language and Culture", Longman, 2ed
- [29] Lall Marie (2011) "Pakistani Women and Education: The Shifting Patterns of Ethnicity and Class" in Bolognani M., Lyon S.M. (eds) "Pakistan and Its Diaspora", Palgrave Macmillan, New York
- [30] Lenze Jana, and Klasen Stephan (2017) "Does Women's Labor Force Participation Reduce Domestic Violence? Evidence from Jordan", *Feminist Economics*, Vol.23 No. 1, pp.1-29
- [31] Mabsout Ramzi, and Van Staveren Irene (2010) "Disentangling Bargaining Power from Individual and Household Level to Institutions: Evidence on Women's Position in Ethiopia", *World Development*, Vol.38 No.5, pp.783-796

- [32] Menon Nidhiya, Van der Meulen-Rodgers Yana, and Kennedy Alexis (2017) "Land Reform and Welfare in Vietnam: Why Gender of the Land-rights Holder matters", *Journal of International Development*, Vol. 29, pp.454-472
- [33] Mishra, Khusbu, and Sam Abdoul (2016) "Does Women's Land Ownership Promote their Empowerment? Empirical Evidence from Nepal", *World Development*, Vol. 78, pp.360-371
- [34] Naqvi Zareen, and Shahnaz Lubna (2002) "How do women decide to work in Pakistan?", *The Pakistan Development Review*, Vol. 41 No.4, pp.495-513
- [35] Niaz Unaiza, Hassan Sehar-un-nisa, and Tariq Qudsia (2017) "Situational Analysis of Intimate Partner Violence Interventions in South Asian and Middle Eastern Countries", *Partner Abuse*, Vol. 8. No. 1, pp.47-86
- [36] O'Hara Corey, and Clement Floriance (2008) "Power as agency: A critical reflection on the measurement of womens empowerment in the development sector", *World Development*, Vol. 106, pp. 111-123
- [37] Rahman Tariq (1996) "Language and Politics in Pakistan", Oxford University Press
- [38] Reyes Angela (2010) "Chapter 15 - Language and Ethnicity" in Hornberger Nancy, and McKay Sandra "Sociolinguistics and Language Education", Channel View Publications, pp.398-426
- [39] Sohini Paul (2016) "Women's Labour Force Participation and Domestic Violence: Evidence from India", *Journal of South Asian Development*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 224-250
- [40] Tauchen Hellen, Witte D. Anne, and Long K. Sharon (1991) "Domestic Violence: A Nonrandom Affair", *International Economic Review*, Vol. 32 No.2, pp.491-511
- [41] Tauchen, Helen, and Witte D. Anne (1995) "The Dynamics of Domestic Violence", *American Economic Review*, Vol. 85 No.2, pp. 414-418
- [42] Tahir Nadia (2017) "Does aid cause conflict in Pakistan?", *Defence and Peace Economics*, Vol. 28 No.1, pp.112-135
- [43] UNHDP (2016) "Human Development for Everyone - Briefing note for countries on the 2016 Human Development Report - Pakistan", [http://hdr.undp.org/sites/all/themes/hdr\\_theme/country-notes/PAK.pdf](http://hdr.undp.org/sites/all/themes/hdr_theme/country-notes/PAK.pdf), last accessed 03/20/2018
- [44] WEF - World Economic Forum (2016) "The Global Gender Gap Report 2016", <http://reports.weforum.org/global-gender-gap-report-2016/>, last accessed 03/20/2018
- [45] WHO (2005) "WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence against women", <http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/violence/24159358X/en/>, last accessed 10/04/2018
- [46] Yuval-Davis Nira (1994) "Women, Ethnicity and Empowerment", *Feminism and Psychology*, Vol. 4 No.1, pp.179-197

## 6. Tables

Table 1: Language spoken by ethnicity

Ethnicity / Language	Urdu	Punjabi	Sindhi	Pushto	Baluchi	Baruhi	Sariaki	Others	Total
Urdu	1,229	32	14	2	1	2	3	3	1,286
%	95.57	2.49	1.09	0.16	0.08	0.16	0.23	0.23	100.00
Punjabi	549	2,485	3	8	2	1	6	8	3,062
%	17.93	81.16	0.10	0.26	0.07	0.03	0.20	0.26	100.00
Sindhi	21	0	1,223	6	6	4	17	2	1,279
%	1.64	0.00	95.62	0.47	0.47	0.31	1.33	0.16	100.00
Pushto	68	9	4	2,827	3	4	4	27	2,946
%	2.31	0.31	0.14	95.96	0.10	0.14	0.14	0.92	100.00
Balochi	6	0	24	17	530	13	7	0	597
%	1.01	0.00	4.02	2.85	88.78	2.18	1.17	0.00	100.00
English	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3
%	33.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.33	33.33	0.00	0.00	100.00
Barauhi	2	0	11	7	9	538	1	1	569
%	0.35	0.00	1.93	1.23	1.58	94.55	0.18	0.18	100.00
Siraiaki	29	10	70	5	2	7	1,213	4	1,340
%	2.16	0.75	5.22	0.37	0.15	0.52	90.52	0.30	100.00
Hindko	84	18	7	9	0	0	6	426	550
%	15.27	3.27	1.27	1.64	0.00	0.00	1.09	77.45	100.00
Kashmiri	8	5	0	1	0	0	0	18	32
%	25.00	15.63	0.00	3.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	56.25	100.00
Shina	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	647	650
%	0.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	99.54	100.00
Brushaski	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	116
%	0.86	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	99.14	100.00
Wakhi	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
%	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	100.00
Chitrali/Khwar	52	0	0	14	0	0	0	50	116
%	44.83	0.00	0.00	12.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	43.10	100.00
Balti	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	372	385
%	3.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.26	0.00	96.62	100.00
Pahari	11	5	2	0	0	3	0	19	40
%	27.50	12.50	5.00	0.00	0.00	7.50	0.00	47.50	100.00
Potowari	23	54	0	0	0	2	0	28	107
%	21.50	50.47	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.87	0.00	26.17	100.00
Marwari	7	0	20	0	0	0	1	43	71
%	9.86	0.00	28.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.41	60.56	100.00
Farsi	3	0	0	2	2	0	0	8	15
%	20.00	0.00	0.00	13.33	13.33	0.00	0.00	53.33	100.00
Others	93	4	15	3	0	0	1	271	387
%	24.03	1.03	3.88	0.78	0.00	0.00	0.26	70.03	100.00
Total	2,203	2,622	1,393	2,905	556	577	1,259	2,043	13,558
%	16.25	19.34	10.27	21.43	4.10	4.26	9.29	15.07	100.00

Ethnic groups by self-identification. Language spoken can be found the head of each column. Based on the Pakistan DHS (PHDS) sample from 2012/13.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics - Women Empowerment

	Overall	Beaten	Landownership	Working
<b>Media Exposure</b>				
Read Newspaper	25.50	17.63	54.23	22.31
Listen Radio	17.56	18.28	24.05	18.47
Some Literacy	43.76	30.97	68.06	34.61
<b>Family Planning</b>				
Contraception	34.30	37.42	44.11	34.57
Not Having Sex	11.24	10.00	17.31	8.61
Wanted Last Child	81.60	75.43	82.46	78.46
Heard of Family Planning (TV)	25.78	24.09	36.88	27.39
Visited Health Facility (12mo)	71.46	68.60	77.57	77.19
Husband opposes contraception	9.72	14.29	5.77	10.36
Want more children	41.51	32.67	38.52	37.69
Desire for more children(2yrs)	20.44	13.56	21.31	22.45
If Husbands has same desire	54.48	44.99	63.35	54.16
Ideal number of children	4.28	4.85	3.63	4.39
Decision maker for birth contr	8.11	13.22	4.31	9.26
<b>Health</b>				
Women's BMI	2448	2444	2629	2343
Smoke	1.39	3.44	0.38	2.53
Permission to go to doctor	21.61	40.00	7.22	20.58
Distance to doctor problem	39.97	55.91	19.77	39.71
Do not want to go alone	53.36	66.88	36.88	48.46
Decides on healthcare	10.48	11.11	15.16	13.79
<b>Other</b>				
Residing with husband	88.57	90.67	88.11	90.90
Age at having sex first	18.85	18.23	20.77	18.66
Having sex recently	73.40	76.89	70.90	73.74
<b>Women's employment</b>				
Currently working	19.82	28.45	27.00	
Can decide on spending income	50.53	44.55	56.92	49.39
Decides on large purchases	7.02	6.67	9.43	9.30
Decides on family visits	8.89	7.78	9.84	10.59
Owens house	2.26	2.15	24.33	3.09
Owens land	1.94	1.08	100	2.64
Earns more than husband	9.31	10.00	10.77	9.89
<b>Domestic Violence</b>				
Beating justified if going out	33.27	42.80	21.29	31.00
Beating justified if argues	37.34	46.45	23.95	35.73
<b>Autonomy</b>				
Say in choosing husband	81.65	78.49	83.27	77.63
Say in selling house alone	64.38	40.00	78.13	66.27

Own calculations based on the Pakistan DHS 2012/13 survey.



Table 3: Descriptive Statistics - Women Empowerment by language

Language	Beaten	Landownership	Education	Radio	Newspaper	Contraception	Health visit	Working	Decides earnings	health care	Large purchases	family visits	Sum	Average
1 Urdu	.088	.033	.78	.194	.518	.472	.768	.150	.563	.150	.086	.097	11	0.91
2 Punjabi	.111	.021	.56	.134	.307	.409	.765	.259	.527	.138	.104	.101	11	0.91
3 Sindhi	.078	.002	.30	.193	.150	.243	.856	.341	.505	.064	.051	.104	5	0.41
4 Pushto	.191	.008	.28	.181	.165	.310	.661	.060	.556	.076	.053	.064	2	0.16
5 Baluchi	.175	.014	.27	.239	.167	.201	.584	.337	.295	.059	.053	.092	3	0.25
7 Baruhi	.412	.003	.12	.164	.097	.154	.244	.204	.192	.019	.019	.014	1	0.08
8 Sariaki	.138	.042	.27	.177	.167	.305	.847	.390	.577	.092	.060	.062	5	0.41
9 Others	.078	.020	.43	.172	.223	.347	.657	.114	.464	.127	.071	.124	6	0.50
Overall	.131	.019	.437	.175	.255	.343	.714	.198	.507	.104	.070	.088		

Language spoken at home. Own calculations based on the Pakistan DHS 2012/13 survey.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics - Women Empowerment by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Beaten	Landownership	Education	Radio	Newspaper	Contraception	Health visit	Working	Decides earnings	health care	Large purchases	family visits	Sum	Average
1 urdu	.074	.024	.815	.195	.547	.452	.804	.138	.586	.160	.091	.101	11	0.91
2 punjabi	.114	.022	.604	.139	.342	.420	.757	.250	.535	.134	.101	.099	11	0.91
3 sindhi	.072	.002	.313	.194	.158	.248	.849	.336	.504	.070	.053	.106	5	0.41
4 pushto	.194	.009	.290	.184	.166	.313	.656	.059	.543	.079	.053	.064	2	0.16
5 balochi	.170	.013	.271	.234	.167	.207	.577	.344	.306	.055	.045	.085	2	0.16
6 english	0	0	.666	0	.333	.333	.666	.333	.5	.333	.333	0	n.a.	n.a.
7 barauhi	.413	.003	.105	.156	.089	.154	.240	.202	.171	.018	.023	.018	1	0.08
8 siraiki	.137	.044	.285	.181	.173	.312	.852	.385	.563	.091	.062	.067	5	0.41
9 hindko	.105	.045	.558	.198	.34	.34	.727	.134	.605	.165	.138	.161	10	0.83
10 kashmiri	0	.093	.75	.187	.406	.5	.812	.161	0	.166	.166	.1	9	0.75
11 shina	.053	.009	.42	.136	.206	.341	.638	.057	.441	.055	.028	.065	1	0.08
12 brushaski	.051	.043	.577	.232	.318	.465	.758	.120	.416	.181	.1	.127	10	0.83
13 wakhi	n.a.	0	.5	0	.5	.5	1	0	n.a.	.5	.5	0	n.a.	n.a.
14 chitrali/khwar	.029	.034	.362	.224	.189	.448	.801	.051	.833	.026	.035	.035	6	0.5
15 balti	.046	.015	.366	.210	.149	.368	.540	.075	.392	.226	.034	.215	5	0.41
16 pahari	.266	.025	.85	.4	.65	.65	.575	.125	.666	.282	.128	.128	8	0.66
17 potowari	.068	.018	.869	.289	.467	.532	.792	.106	0.5	.12	.11	.08	7	0.58
18 marwari	.263	0	.169	.154	.070	.309	.943	.591	.441	.057	.042	.085	2	0.16
19 farsi	.25	0	.6	.133	.333	.533	.466	.2	0	.214	.142	.214	7	0.58
96 Others	.07	.023	.426	.098	.221	.302	.699	.202	.523	.103	.059	.089	5	0.41
Overall	.131	.019	.437	.175	.255	.343	.714	.198	.507	.104	.070	.089		

Ethnic groups by self-identification. Landownership refers to owning land alone. Another possibility would be to use owning it jointly. Even this would give some autonomy, given > 90 percent of the women of have ownership rights at all in any form. Own calculations based on the Pakistan DHS 2012/13 survey.

Table 5: Baseline regressions

Deciding on:	Health			Earnings			Purchases			Family visit		
Landownership	.006 (.022)	.007 (.022)	.008 (.022)	.049 (.061)	.024 (.062)	.025 (.062)	-.004 (.018)	-.003 (.018)	-.003 (.018)	-.010 (.019)	-.008 (.019)	-.009 (.019)
Age	.004*** (.000)	.004*** (.000)	.004*** (.000)	.000 (.001)	.0009 (.001)	.000 (.001)	.004*** (.000)	.004*** (.000)	.004*** (.000)	.004*** (.000)	.004*** (.000)	.004*** (.000)
Education	.029*** (.006)	.026*** (.006)	.025*** (.006)	.017 (.027)	.026 (.027)	.023 (.028)	.016*** (.005)	.014** (.005)	.012** (.005)	.019*** (.006)	.017*** (.006)	.016*** (.006)
Working	.040*** (.007)	.042*** (.007)	.043*** (.007)	-.103*** (.032)	-.104*** (.032)	-.101*** (.033)	.022*** (.006)	.021*** (.006)	.022*** (.006)	.018*** (.007)	.016** (.007)	.016** (.007)
Age Diff	-.001*** (.000)	-.001*** (.000)	-.001*** (.000)	-.003** (.001)	-.003** (.001)	-.003** (.001)	-.001*** (.000)	-.001*** (.000)	-.001*** (.000)	-.001*** (.000)	-.001*** (.000)	-.001*** (.000)
Urban	.022*** (.006)	.019*** (.006)	.018*** (.006)	.064** (.027)	.077*** (.028)	.074*** (.028)	.012** (.005)	.012** (.005)	.013** (.005)	.003 (.006)	.003 (.006)	.001 (.006)
Children	-.002 (.001)	-.001 (.001)	-.001 (.001)	.004 (.004)	.004 (.004)	.003 (.004)	-.001 (.001)	-.000 (.001)	-.000 (.001)	-.003** (.001)	-.002** (.001)	-.002** (.001)
Wealth	.002 (.002)	.001 (.002)	.001 (.002)	.041*** (.011)	.047*** (.011)	.045*** (.011)	.001 (.002)	.001 (.002)	.000 (.002)	-.000 (.002)	.000 (.002)	.001 (.002)
N	12966	12966	12961	2263	2263	2263	12969	12969	12964	12969	12969	12964
R <sup>2</sup>	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.07	0.08	0.08	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.03
Language	no	yes	no	no	yes	no	no	yes	no	no	yes	no
Ethnicity	no	no	yes	no	no	yes	no	no	yes	no	no	yes
F-Test		P=0.0021	P=0.000		P=0.0016	P=0.0000		P= 0.0000	P=0.0027		P=0.0000	P= 0.0000

Note: Robust standard errors are in parentheses. Level of significance is \*\*\* 1 Percent, \*\* 5 Percent, \* 10 Percent. F-Test refers to the joint significance of language or ethnicity fixed effects. P-value is reported. education.

Table 6: Effect of landownership and working by language group

Deciding on	Health					Earnings					Purchase					Family visits				
	Landowner	Working	n	$R^2$		Landowner	Working	n	$R^2$		Landowner	Working	n	$R^2$		Landowner	Working	n	$R^2$	
1 Urdu	.024	.071***	2103	0.02		.045	-.157	314	0.05		-.005	.046**	2105	0.02		.035	.018	2105	0.02	
2 Punjabi	.021	.039**	2458	0.04		.092	-.105	495	0.04		-.021	.000	2458	0.05		-.025	.029*	2458	0.04	
3 Sindhi	-.141***	.025	1328	0.03		.116	-.033	465	0.12		.203	.029**	1327	0.04		-.160***	-.010	1328	0.02	
4 Pushto	.089	.069**	2822	0.04		.207	-.257**	160	0.11		-.017	.036	2823	0.03		.121	.023	2822	0.02	
5 Baluchi	-.065**	.013	533	0.05		-.303**	-.134	132	0.16		.185	-.023	533	0.07		-.094***	.001	533	0.04	
7 Baruhi	-.028	.024	557	0.18		-.698***	.342	78	0.40		-.008	.008	558	0.08		-.037*	.015	558	0.04	
8 Sariaki	-.083**	.042**	1196	0.05		-.015	-.141*	406	0.04		-.085***	.015	1196	0.02		-.049**	-.013	1196	0.03	
9 Others	.045	.047*	1969	0.01		-.032	-.294**	213	0.13		.095	.044*	1969	0.05		-.043	.091***	1969	0.02	

Note: Robust standard errors are in parentheses. Level of significance is \*\*\* 1 Percent, \*\* 5 Percent, \* 10 Percent. F-Test refers to the joint significance of language or ethnicity fixed effects. P-value is reported. education.

Table 7: Effect of landownership and working by ethnicity

Deciding on	Health				Earnings				Purchase				Family visits			
	Landowner	Working	n	$R^2$	Landowner	Working	n	$R^2$	Landowner	Working	n	$R^2$	Landowner	Working	n	$R^2$
1 Urdu	.039	.093***	1233	0.03	-.329	-.098	174	0.09	.027	.063**	1233	0.02	-.056	.017	1233	0.02
2 Punjabi	-.006	.042**	2887	0.03	.122	-.119*	577	0.03	-.016	.012	2888	0.04	.012	.029**	2888	0.04
3 Sindhi	-.144***	.017	1215	0.03	.120	-.039	416	0.12	.212	.032**	1214	0.03	-.150***	-.011	1215	0.01
4 Pushto	.009	.071**	2863	0.04	.149	-.203*	160	0.11	.022	.029	2864	0.03	.091	.027	2863	0.02
5 Balochi	-.064**	.014	570	0.05	-.290**	-.156	150	0.12	.192	-.029	570	0.07	-.088***	-.013	570	0.04
6 English	n.a.	n.a.	3	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	2	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	3	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	3	n.a.
7 Barauhi	-.015	.010	551	0.11	-.808***	.024	76	0.40	-.004	.005	552	0.13	-.031	.010	552	0.11
8 Siraiki	-.030	.040**	1273	0.05	.020	-.102	432	0.03	-.073***	.010	1273	0.03	-.020	-.014	1273	0.03
9 Hindko	.170	.105*	520	0.08	.116	-.195	71	0.25	.015	.077	521	0.04	-.024	.081	521	0.08
10 Kashmiri	-.258	.162	30	0.28	n.a.	n.a.	4	n.a.	-.232	.397**	30	0.48	-.184	.440**	30	0.67
11 Shina	.085	.051	628	0.03	-.252	-.085	34	0.30	.122	.071	628	0.03	.061	.135*	628	0.04
12 Brushaski	-.290**	-.077	110	0.14	n.a.	n.a.	12	n.a.	-.372**	.026	110	0.12	-.222	-.071	110	0.08
13 Wakhi	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	13	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	2	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	2	n.a.
14 Chitrali/Khwar	-.173	-.003	114	0.22	n.a.	n.a.	6	n.a.	.146	-.058	114	0.42	-.042	-.048	114	0.29
15 Balti	.035	.091	375	0.01	n.a.	-.444***	28	0.40	-.053**	.022	375	0.03	-.228***	.033	375	0.01
16 Pahari	.640**	.590***	39	0.24	n.a.	n.a.	3	n.a.	-.065	.353	39	0.16	-.129	.372	39	0.39
17 Potowari	-.144	.077	97	0.05	-.628	n.a.	8	0.75	.000	-.114**	97	0.11	-.088	-.002	97	0.05
18 Marwari	n.a.	n.a.	70	n.a.	n.a.	-.257	43	0.21	n.a.	.001	70	0.12	n.a.	-.039	70	0.08
19 Farsi	n.a.	n.a.	14	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	2	n.a.	n.a.	-.091	12	0.78	n.a.	-.070	14	0.77
96 Others	-.034	.031	367	0.30	.715**	-.402**	65	0.30	-.022	.043	367	0.07	.060	.074	367	0.08

Note: Robust standard errors are in parentheses. Level of significance is \*\*\* 1 Percent, \*\* 5 Percent, \* 10 Percent. F-Test refers to the joint significance of language or ethnicity fixed effects. P-value is reported. education.

Table 8: Baseline regressions - Domestic Violence

DV :	Beaten			Threatened			Insulted			Humiliated		
Landownership	-.038 (.031)	-.039 (.030)	-.032 (.031)	.015 (.023)	.018 (.023)	.020 (.023)	-.036 (.046)	-.038 (.045)	-.039 (.045)	-.035 (.042)	-.039 (.041)	-.041 (.042)
Working	.029* (.015)	.030* (.015)	.028* (.015)	.011 (.009)	.012 (.009)	.011 (.009)	.039** (.018)	.037** (.018)	.039** (.018)	.035** (.017)	.033* (.017)	.036** (.017)
Alcoholism	.203*** (.034)	.204*** (.034)	.207*** (.033)	.060*** (.020)	.060*** (.020)	.060*** (.020)	.234*** (.034)	.239*** (.034)	.240*** (.034)	.196*** (.034)	.197*** (.034)	.199*** (.034)
N	3404	3404	3403	3499	3499	3498	3447	3447	3446	3531	3531	3530
R <sup>2</sup>	0.08	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.11	0.14	0.14	0.09	0.12	0.12
Language	no	yes	no	no	yes	no	no	yes	no	no	yes	no
Ethnicity	no	no	yes	no	no	yes	no	no	yes	no	no	yes
F-Test		P=0.0000	P=0.000		P=0.0067	P=0.0000		P= 0.0000	P=0.0000		P=0.0000	P= 0.0000

Note: Robust standard errors are in parentheses. Level of significance is \*\*\* 1 Percent, \*\* 5 Percent, \* 10 Percent. F-Test refers to the joint significance of language or ethnicity fixed effects. P-value is reported. education.

Table 9: Effect of landownership and working by language group on domestic violence

DV	Beaten				Threatened				Insulted				Humiliated			
	Landowner	Working	n	$R^2$	Landowner	Working	n	$R^2$	Landowner	Working	n	$R^2$	Landowner	Working	n	$R^2$
1 Urdu	-.011	.070*	597	0.06	.011	.012	604	0.06	.015	.052	595	0.09	-.081	.022	606	0.08
2 Punjabi	-.077***	.052*	691	0.11	.044	.012	715	0.05	-.059	.039	701	0.08	-.034	.016	719	0.06
3 Sindhi	n.a.	.002	356	0.10	n.a.	.018	368	0.04	n.a.	.023	365	0.14	n.a.	.050	370	0.14
4 Pushto	-.003	.064	618	0.13	-.007	.023	652	0.02	-.095	.156**	626	0.18	-.122***	.139**	656	0.14
5 Baluchi	-.134**	-.002	155	0.15	-.034	-.050	156	0.09	-.254**	-.067	157	0.17	-.204***	-.000	158	0.21
7 Baruhi	n.a.	-.032	143	0.17	n.a.	.035	137	0.10	n.a.	-.031	151	0.24	n.a.	-.057	152	0.16
8 Sariaki	-.001	-.015	313	0.16	.016	.024	328	0.06	.041	.084	319	0.15	.070	.040	330	0.14
9 Others	-.082**	.036	531	0.06	-.014	-.010*	539	0.03	-.160***	-.034	533	0.11	-.104**	.011	540	0.06

Note: Robust standard errors are in parentheses. Level of significance is \*\*\* 1 Percent, \*\* 5 Percent, \* 10 Percent. F-Test refers to the joint significance of language or ethnicity fixed effects. P-value is reported. education.

Table 10: Effect of landownership and working by ethnicity on domestic violence

DV	Beaten				Threaten				Insulted				Humiliated			
	Landowner	Working	n	$R^2$	Landowner	Working	n	$R^2$	Landowner	Working	n	$R^2$	Landowner	Working	n	$R^2$
1 Urdu	.011	.099*	363	0.09	-.026	.036	366	0.07	-.007	.049	364	0.09	-.059	.034	364	0.08
2 Punjabi	-.020	.061**	805	0.08	.109	.007	831	0.05	-.021	.058	813	0.06	.015	.025	835	0.06
3 Sindhi	n.a.	.007	330	0.07	n.a.	.021	343	0.04	n.a.	.046	340	0.09	n.a.	.055	345	0.12
4 Pushto	.001	.069	625	0.13	-.012	.021	660	0.03	-.092	.159**	634	0.19	-.154***	.130*	664	0.13
5 Balochi	-.155**	-.003	159	0.14	-.041	-.048	160	0.08	-.285**	-.065	161	0.17	-.232***	.0001	162	0.19
6 English	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
7 Barauhi	n.a.	-.044	145	0.16	n.a.	.032	140	0.10	n.a.	-.028	154	0.25	n.a.	-.054	155	0.17
8 Siraiki	-.025	.012	330	0.07	.006	.027	343	0.07	.071	.084*	335	0.17	.038	.057	345	0.15
9 Hindko	-.099*	-.081	138	0.19	-.024	-.020	144	0.04	-.173	-.056	140	0.11	-.174**	-.032	145	0.10
10 Kashmiri	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
11 Shina	n.a.	-.008	164	0.06	n.a.	.014	164	0.11	n.a.	.014	163	0.12	n.a.	-.017	164	0.07
12 Brushaski	-.107	-.100	36	0.24	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-.107	-.100	36	0.24	-.112	-.070	36	0.26
13 Wakhi	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
14 Chitrali/Khwar	-.062	-.036	33	0.25	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	-.257	.303	31	0.57	-.102	.325	34	0.39
15 Balti	-.028	.149	106	0.06	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	.016	-.064	107	0.06	-.030	.052	107	0.07
16 Pahari	-.413	n.a.	15	0.77	-.190	n.a.	15	0.30	-.705	n.a.	15	0.69	-.600	n.a.	15	0.90
17 Potowari	-.487	.169	27	0.40	-.131	.095	27	0.48	.066	-.209	26	0.64	-.172	-.085	27	0.40
18 Marwari	n.a.	-.270	19	0.42	n.a.	-.702**	19	0.77	n.a.	-.628	19	0.58	n.a.	-.793	19	0.61
19 Farsi	n.a.	n.a.	4	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
96 Others	-.176*	.028	96	0.30	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	.095	-.017	96	0.30	.045	.019	97	0.29

Note: Robust standard errors are in parentheses. Level of significance is \*\*\* 1 Percent, \*\* 5 Percent, \* 10 Percent. F-Test refers to the joint significance of language or ethnicity fixed effects. P-value is reported.